#### & VAN EATON MILLER

- P. L. L. C. -

MATTHEW C. AMES KENNETH A. BRUNETTI† FREDERICK E. ELLROD III MARCI L. FRISCHKORN MITSUKO R. HERRERA† WILLIAM L. LOWERY

†Admitted to Practice in California Only

Incorporating the Practice of Miller & Holbrooke

1155 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. **SUITE 1000** WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-4320 TELEPHONE (202) 785-0600 FAX (202) 785-1234

MILLER & VAN EATON, L.L.P. 400 MONTGOMERY STREET SUITE 501 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104-1215 TELEPHONE (415) 477-3650 FAX (415) 477-3652

WWW.MILLERVANEATON.COM

May 20, 2002

WILLIAM R. MALONE NICHOLAS P. MILLER HOLLY L. SAURER JOSEPH VAN EATON

OF COUNSEL: JAMES R. HOBSON GERARD L. LEDERER\*\* JOHN F. NOBLE

\*\*Admitted to Practice in New Jersey Only

Marlene H. Dortch. Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW Washington, D.C. 20554

> Ex Parte Submission in GN Docket No. 00-185 and CS Docket No. 02-52, CC Re: Docket No. 96-98 and WT Docket No. 99-217, and CC Docket 98-146.

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Pursuant to Section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.1206, the Commission's Local and State Government Advisory Committee (the "LSGAC"), on behalf of itself and the other local and state governmental entities listed in Attachment I, submits this notice of ex parte communication in the above-captioned proceedings.

On May 17, 2002, the individuals listed in Attachment I, representing the local and state governmental entities and organizations indicated, met at various times during the day with Deputy Chief Jeff Steinberg, Commercial Wireless Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Associate Chief Jane Jackson, Wireline Competition Bureau and Associate Chief Peggy Greene, Media Bureau. The LSGAC also met with Deputy Chief Thomas Wyatt, Consumer Governmental Affairs Bureau, Deputy Chief Jeanne Kowalski, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, and Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy.

Representatives of the Industry Rights-of-Way Working Group ("IRWWG") were also present during portions of these meetings. The IRWWG represents the companies and organizations listed in Attachment II.

The discussions addressed concerns regarding broadband deployment, local authority over cable modem service and reasonable compensation for use of local rights-of-way.

In the meeting with the IRWWG, the LSGAC asked the IRWWG to express their concerns with local government activities affecting access to rights-of-way. The IRWWG expressed concerned with paying any compensation for rights-of-way and delays caused to rightof-way entry when there is no compensation agreement between the local authority and a telecommunications facilities provider. The IRWWG asserted the industry did not have substantial problems with local government management of the rights-of-way. LSGAC members and staff responded that industry refusal to fairly compensate local governments for use of rights-of-way was unreasonable. Further there was a need for the industry to document the actual scope of the problem of delayed access. Specifically, was this a small number of incidents relative to the number of projects and local jurisdictions across the nation? Was this an endemic source of delay, or an occasional cause of delay to construction projects? Were there other solutions to the problems than federal preemption? If federal preemption was appropriate, how could it be narrowed to the smallest, least intrusive means? Further, the industry needed to engage in discussions with the representatives of local government to address these questions before petitioning the FCC for relief. Good will and serious statistical information should lead both sides to an amicable solution, based on education and agreed-to best practices. The conversation should start with serious management issues. Suggested issues included: appropriate GIS mapping details; appropriate local authority to impose and enforce right of way construction requirements that facilitate multiple operator entry and use of the rights-of-way; joint industry insurance and indemnification pools to equalize the burden on various entrants; agreed standards on "restoration to prior condition" of rights-of-way.

To facilitate a meaningful dialogue between the LSGAC and the Industry Rights-of-Way Working Group on these issues, the LSGAC participants recommended the following. There should be further meetings with the IRWWG. These meetings should address the scope and magnitude of the current disagreement between local and state governmental entities and telecommunications providers regarding broadband deployment and reasonable management and compensation practices for use of rights-of-way. The meetings should also determine the range of options available to remedy the existing disagreements. The LSGAC requested the industry review and respond to the recent "Local Officials Guide: Telecommunications and Rights-of-Way" published jointly by the National League of Cities; National Association of Counties; The United States Conference of Mayors; the International Municipal Lawyers Association; and the National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors. Using that document as a starting point, the LSGAC offered to dialogue further with the IRWWG at the next LSGAC meeting.

After the departure of the IRWWG from the meeting, Commission representatives briefed the LSGAC on the status of cable modem, wireline deregulation and competitive networks proceedings and the current status of consumer complaints about cable modem service. The LSGAC expressed its concern with the Commission's March 15, 2002 decision declaring cable modem service an interstate information service, and the public comments of Kenneth Ferree, Chief of the Commission's Media Bureau, relating to cable modem franchise fees in the

- 3 -

wake of this decision. Also, the LSGAC expressed its opposition to Dean Snowden's letter to Ken Fellman proposing that cable modem consumer complaints received by the Commission should be forwarded to local franchising authorities for appropriate handling.

The LSGAC asked the Commission staff in the persons of Mr. Snowden and Mr. Ferree to clarify the Commission's position with respect to the scope of local authority over cable modem service during the pendency of the current NPRM. In particular the LSGAC asked the two bureau chiefs to address the consumer complaint issue and reconcile the apparent disconnect between the Commission's classification of cable modem service and the appropriate forum for consumer complaints about this service.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please direct any questions regarding this *ex parte* submission to the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
MILLER & VAN EATON, P.L.L.C.
WILLER & VAN EATON, P.L.L.C.
Nicholas P. Miller

On behalf of the Local and State Government Advisory Committee

By

- 4 -

### **Attachment I**

### **Local and State Government Advisory Committee and Staff**

Representative

#### NATOA Libby Beaty Portland, Oregon Pamela Beery Paula Scavera State of Alaska United States Conference of Mayors Ron Thaniel Miller & Van Eaton, P.L.L.C. Gerry Lederer Little Rock, Arkansas Jim Dailey Plano, Texas Steve Stovall Eugene, Oregon Nathy Nathanson

Government/Organization

Miller & Van Eaton, P.L.L.C.

Montgomery County, Maryland
Boston, Massachusetts

Nick Miller
Jane Lawton
Merita Hopkins

Boston, Massachusetts Christopher Mensoian

NACO
Montgomery County, Maryland
Arvada, Colorado
Dearborn, Michigan
National League of Cities
Lansing, Michigan
Dearbord
Dearbord
Doug Peterson
David Svanda

- 6 -

## **Attachment II**

# **Industry Rights-of-Way Working Group**

<u>Organization</u> <u>Representative</u>

**Preston Gates** Marty Stern Cole Raywid Scott Thompson WorldCom Kevin Gallagher Karen Johnson WorldCom AT&T Frank Simone Swidler Berlin L. Elise Dieterich SBC Jay Bennett David Mielke Verizon Kevin Minsky Swidler Berlin Teresa Gaugler ALTS Pete Sywenki Sprint NTIA Tim Sloan